

# Nonexistence of invariant distributions supported on the limit set

Ulrich Bunke and Martin Olbrich

February 1, 2008

## Contents

|          |                                                            |          |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Statement of the result</b>                             | <b>0</b> |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Geometry of geometrically finite discrete subgroups</b> | <b>5</b> |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Proof of Theorem 1.8</b>                                | <b>7</b> |

## 1 Statement of the result

Let  $X$  be a symmetric space of negative curvature. Then  $X$  either belongs to one of the three families of real, complex, or quaternionic hyperbolic spaces, or it is the Cayley hyperbolic plane.

Let  $G$  be a connected linear Lie group which finitely covers the isometry group of  $X$ . Furthermore, let  $\Gamma \subset G$  be a discrete subgroup. We assume that  $\Gamma$  is geometrically finite. We refer to Definition 2.1 for a precise explanation of this notion. If  $X$  is a real hyperbolic space, then  $\Gamma$  is geometrically finite iff it admits a fundamental domain with finitely many totally geodesic faces. In the other cases the definition is more complicated. Essentially,  $\Gamma$  is geometrically finite if the corresponding locally symmetric space  $\Gamma \backslash X$  has finitely many cusps and can be compactified by adding a geodesic boundary and closing the cusps. In

particular, if  $\Gamma$  is cocompact, or convex-cocompact, or the locally symmetric space  $\Gamma \backslash X$  has finite volume, then  $\Gamma$  is geometrically finite.

We adjoin the geodesic boundary  $\partial X$  to  $X$  and obtain a compact manifold with boundary  $\bar{X} := X \cup \partial X$ . A point of  $\partial X$  is an equivalence class of geodesic rays where two rays are in the same class if they run in bounded distance to each other. The action of  $G$  extends naturally to  $\bar{X}$ . Let  $\Lambda_\Gamma \subset \partial X$  denote the limit set of  $\Gamma$ . It is defined as the set of accumulation points of any orbit  $\Gamma \mathbf{o}$  in  $\bar{X}$  for  $\mathbf{o} \in X$ .

We consider a  $G$ -equivariant irreducible complex vector bundle  $V \rightarrow \partial X$  and a finite-dimensional representation  $(\varphi, V_\varphi)$  of  $\Gamma$ . Furthermore, by  $\Lambda \rightarrow \partial X$  we denote the  $G$ -equivariant bundle of densities on  $\partial X$ . To  $V$  we associate the  $G$ -equivariant bundle

$$\tilde{V} := \text{Hom}(V, \Lambda) .$$

The space  $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V)$  of distribution sections of  $V$  is then, by definition, the topological dual of  $C^\infty(\partial X, \tilde{V})$ . We define the space of invariant distribution sections of  $V$  with twist  $\varphi$  by

**Definition 1.1**

$$I(\Gamma, V, \varphi) := (C^\infty(\partial X, V) \otimes V_\varphi)^\Gamma .$$

Next we introduce some real quantities which represent growth properties of the geometric objects introduced so far. We first define the number  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$  which is a measure of the volume growth of the symmetric space  $X$ . We use this number in order to normalize the critical exponents below. Let  $\mathbf{o}$  be any point of  $X$ , and let  $B(r, \mathbf{o})$  denote the ball of radius  $r$  centered at  $\mathbf{o}$ .

**Definition 1.2**

$$\rho := \frac{1}{2} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \text{vol } B(r, \mathbf{o})}{r} .$$

The growth of the action of  $G$  on the bundle  $V$  is measured by the quantity  $s(V) \in \mathbb{R}$ . Note that  $\Lambda$  is the complexification of a real orientable line bundle. It is therefore trivial if

considered merely as a vector bundle, but it is not trivial as a  $G$ -equivariant bundle. The bundle  $\Lambda$  can be represented by a cocycle of positive transition functions. If  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ , then raising the transition functions to the power  $\alpha$ , we obtain a new cocycle which represents the  $G$ -equivariant bundle  $\Lambda^\alpha$ .

**Definition 1.3**  *$s(V)$  is defined as the unique number such that  $V \otimes \Lambda^{s(V)} \cong V^\sharp$  as  $G$ -equivariant bundles, where  $V^\sharp$  denotes the complex conjugate bundle of  $\tilde{V}$ .*

For example, if  $V = \partial X \times \mathbb{C}$  is the trivial bundle, then  $s(V) = 1$ . More generally,  $s(\Lambda^\alpha) = 1 - 2\text{Re}(\alpha)$ .

The normalized growth of  $\Gamma$  is expressed by the critical exponent

**Definition 1.4**

$$d_\Gamma := \frac{1}{\rho} \inf \left\{ \nu \mid \sum_{g \in \Gamma} \text{dist}(g\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{o})^{-\rho-\nu} < \infty \right\}.$$

This definition is independent of the choice of  $\mathbf{o} \in X$ . Since  $\Gamma$  is discrete and infinite we have  $d_\Gamma \in (-1, 1]$ .

The exponent  $d_\varphi$  is a measure for the growth of  $\varphi$ . It is defined by

**Definition 1.5**

$$d_\varphi := \frac{1}{\rho} \inf \left\{ \nu \mid \sup_{g \in \Gamma} \|\varphi(g)\| \text{dist}(g\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{o})^{-\nu} < \infty \right\},$$

where we have fixed any norm  $\|\cdot\|$  on  $\text{End}(V_\varphi)$  and any point  $\mathbf{o} \in X$ . Since  $\Gamma$  is finitely generated, we have  $d_\varphi < \infty$ .

A cusp of  $\Gamma$  is, by definition, a  $\Gamma$ -conjugacy class  $[P]_\Gamma$  of proper parabolic subgroups  $P \subset G$  such that  $\Gamma \cap P$  is infinite and  $\pi(\Gamma \cap P) \subset L$  is precompact, where  $\pi$  is the projection onto the semisimple quotient  $L$  given by the sequence

$$0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow P \xrightarrow{\pi} L \rightarrow 0$$

with  $N \subset P$  denoting the unipotent radical of  $P$ . Note that if  $[P]_\Gamma$  is a cusp of  $\Gamma$ , then  $\Gamma_P := \Gamma \cap P$  again satisfies our assumptions. The limit set of  $\Gamma_P$  consists of the unique fixed point  $\infty_P \subset \partial X$  of  $P$ . Since  $\Gamma_P$  acts properly on  $\Omega_{\Gamma_P} := \partial X \setminus \{\infty_P\}$  and  $\Gamma_P \backslash (\Lambda_\Gamma \setminus \{\infty_P\}) \subset \Gamma_P \backslash \Omega_{\Gamma_P}$  is compact (see Lemma 2.2) we can choose a smooth function  $\chi^{\Gamma_P}$  on  $\Omega_{\Gamma_P}$  such that  $\text{supp}(\chi^{\Gamma_P}) \cap \Lambda_\Gamma$  is a compact subset of  $\Omega_{\Gamma_P}$ ,  $\{\text{supp}(g^* \chi^{\Gamma_P})\}_{g \in \Gamma_P}$  is a locally finite covering of  $\Omega_{\Gamma_P}$ , and  $\sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} g^* \chi^{\Gamma_P} \equiv 1$ . Assume that  $s(V) > d_\Gamma + d_\varphi$ .

**Definition 1.6** *We say that  $f \in I(\Gamma, V, \varphi)$  is strongly supported on the limit set if*

1.  *$f$  is supported on the limit set as a distribution.*
2. *For any  $h \in V^\infty(\partial X, \tilde{V}) \otimes \tilde{V}_\varphi$  and cusp  $[P]_\Gamma$  of  $\Gamma$  we have*

$$\langle f, h \rangle = \sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} \langle \chi^{\Gamma_P} f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}, \tilde{\varphi}(g)^{-1} g^* h \rangle .$$

In order to see that the second condition is well-defined note that  $\text{supp}(\chi^{\Gamma_P} f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}) \subset \text{supp}(\chi^{\Gamma_P}) \cap \Lambda_\Gamma$  is a compact subset of  $\Omega_{\Gamma_P}$ . Therefore the pairing  $\langle \chi^{\Gamma_P} f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}, \tilde{\varphi}(g)^{-1} g^* h \rangle$  is defined. The sum converges because of our assumption  $s(V) > d_\Gamma + d_\varphi \geq d_{\Gamma_P} + d_\varphi$ , which implies that  $\sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} \tilde{\varphi}(g)^{-1} g^* h|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}$  converges in the space of smooth functions. In fact, the argument proving [1], Lemma 4.2, applies in the more general case when  $\Gamma$  is merely geometrically finite. In Lemma 2.4 we will verify that this definition is independent of the choice of  $\chi^{\Gamma_P}$ .

In [3] and [2] we have expressed the condition "strongly supported on the limit set" in the form  $\text{res}^\Gamma(f) = 0$ . While this definition works for all values of  $s(V)$  there we must assume that  $f$  is "deformable". Because in the present paper we are in the "domain of convergence" we can use the simpler and more general definition above.

**Definition 1.7** *By  $I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, V, \varphi)$  we denote the subspace of all  $f \in I(\Gamma, V, \varphi)$  which are strongly supported on the limit set.*

The main result of the present paper can now be formulated as follows.

**Theorem 1.8** *If  $s(V) > d_\Gamma + d_\varphi + \max_{[P]_\Gamma}(0, d_{\Gamma_P} - d_\Gamma + 1)$  (where the maximum is taken over all cusps of  $\Gamma$ ), then  $I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, V, \varphi) = 0$ .*

Let us note the following special case which was already shown in [1], Thm 4.7. The group  $\Gamma$  is called convex cocompact if it acts freely and cocompactly on  $\bar{X} \setminus \Lambda_\Gamma$ . In this case  $\Gamma$  has no cusps and  $I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, V, \varphi)$  is just the space invariant distribution sections of  $V$  with twist  $\varphi$  which are supported on  $\Lambda_\Gamma$ .

**Corollary 1.9** *If  $\Gamma$  is convex cocompact and  $s(V) > d_\Gamma + d_\varphi$ , then  $I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, V, \varphi) = 0$ .*

Back to the general case of a geometrically finite discrete group let  $1$  be the trivial representation of  $\Gamma$ . Then we have  $d_1 = 0$ . In the place of  $V$  we consider  $\Lambda^{\frac{1-d_\Gamma}{2}}$ . Note that  $s(\Lambda^{\frac{1-d_\Gamma}{2}}) = d_\Gamma = d_\Gamma + d_\varphi$ . The space  $I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, \Lambda^{\frac{1-d_\Gamma}{2}}, 1)$  is spanned by the Patterson-Sullivan measure [6], [8], [4], [5], hence  $\dim I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, \Lambda^{\frac{1-d_\Gamma}{2}}, 1) = 1$ . Here we must use the definition of the condition "strongly supported on the limit set" in terms of  $\text{res}^\Gamma$  given in [3].

In order to construct some twisted examples we consider a finite-dimensional  $M$ -spherical representation  $(\pi, V_\pi)$  of  $G$ . Here  $(\pi, V_\pi)$  is called  $M$ -spherical, if for any parabolic subgroup  $P \subset G$  there exists a vector  $0 \neq v \in V_\pi$  and a character  $\chi : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\pi(p)v = \chi(p)v$  for all  $p \in P$ . There is a natural inclusion

$$I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, \Lambda^{\frac{1-d_\Gamma}{2}}, 1) \hookrightarrow I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, \Lambda^{\frac{1-d_\Gamma-d_\pi}{2}}, \pi)$$

showing that  $I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, \Lambda^{\frac{1-d_\Gamma-d_\pi}{2}}, \pi) \neq 0$ . On the other hand,  $s(\Lambda^{\frac{1-d_\Gamma-d_\pi}{2}}) = d_\Gamma + d_\pi$ .

These examples show that our estimate can not be improved in general for convex cocompact  $\Gamma$ . On the other hand, even for geometrically finite  $\Gamma$  we do not know any counterexample to the assertion that already  $s(V) > d_\Gamma + d_\varphi$  implies that  $I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, V, \varphi) = 0$ .

## 2 Geometry of geometrically finite discrete subgroups

If  $\Gamma \subset G$  is a discrete subgroup and  $\Lambda_\Gamma$  is its limit set, then  $\Gamma$  acts on  $\bar{X} \setminus \Lambda_\Gamma$  properly discontinuously. Let  $\bar{Y}_\Gamma$  denote the manifold with boundary  $\bar{Y}_\Gamma := \Gamma \backslash (\bar{X} \setminus \Lambda_\Gamma)$ . If  $[P]_\Gamma$  is a cusp of  $\Gamma$ , then we form the manifold with boundary  $\bar{Y}_{\Gamma_P} := \Gamma_P \backslash (\bar{X} \setminus \{\infty_P\})$ .

**Definition 2.1** *The group  $\Gamma$  is called geometrically finite if the following conditions hold:*

1.  $\Gamma$  has finitely many cusps.
2. There is a bijection between the set of ends of  $\bar{Y}_\Gamma$  and the set of cusps of  $\Gamma$ .
3. If  $[P]_\Gamma$  is a cusp of  $\Gamma$ , then there exists a representative  $\bar{Y}_P$  of the corresponding end of  $\bar{Y}_\Gamma$  and embedding  $e_P : \bar{Y}_P \rightarrow \bar{Y}_{\Gamma_P}$  which is isometric in the interior such that its image  $e_P(\bar{Y}_P)$  represents the end of  $\bar{Y}_{\Gamma_P}$ .

**Lemma 2.2** *If  $[P]_\Gamma$  is a cusp of  $\Gamma$ , then  $\Gamma_P \backslash (\Lambda_\Gamma \setminus \{\infty_P\})$  is a compact subset of  $\Gamma_P \backslash \Omega_{\Gamma_P}$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that  $\Gamma_P \backslash (\Lambda_\Gamma \setminus \{\infty_P\})$  is compact in  $\bar{Y}_{\Gamma_P}$ . Note that  $(\Lambda_\Gamma \setminus \{\infty_P\})$  is closed in  $\bar{X} \setminus \{\infty_P\}$ . Therefore,  $\Gamma_P \backslash (\Lambda_\Gamma \setminus \{\infty_P\})$  is closed in  $\bar{Y}_{\Gamma_P}$ . Furthermore, it is contained in the compact set  $\bar{Y}_{\Gamma_P} \setminus e_P(\bar{Y}_P)$  (note that  $\bar{Y}_P$  is open). The assertion now follows.  $\square$

Let  $\mathbf{o} \in X$  be any point. We consider the Dirichlet domain  $F \subset X$  of  $\Gamma$  with respect to  $\mathbf{o}$ . It is a fundamental domain given by

$$F := \{x \in X \mid \text{dist}(x, \mathbf{o}) \leq \text{dist}(hx, \mathbf{o}) \forall h \in \Gamma\} .$$

If  $[P]_\Gamma$  is a cusp of  $\Gamma$ , then let  $\chi^{\Gamma_P}$  be the cut-off function introduced before Definition 1.6.

**Lemma 2.3** *We can decompose  $F$  as  $F_0 \cup F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_r$ , where  $r$  is the number of cusps  $[P_i]_\Gamma$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , of  $\Gamma$ , and the subsets  $F_i$  satisfy*

1. *The closure of  $F_0$  in  $\bar{X} \setminus \Lambda_\Gamma$  is compact.*
2.  *$\overline{\Gamma_{P_i} F_i} \cap (\Lambda_\Gamma \setminus \{\infty_{P_i}\}) \cap \text{supp}(\chi^{\Gamma_{P_i}}) = \emptyset$  for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ .*

*Proof.* By  $\bar{Y}_0$  we denote the compact subset  $\bar{Y}_\Gamma \setminus \bigcup_{i=1, \dots, r} \bar{Y}_{P_i}$  of  $\bar{Y}_\Gamma$ . Then we define  $F_0 := \Gamma \bar{Y}_0 \cap F$ , where  $\Gamma \bar{Y}_0$  denotes the preimage of  $\bar{Y}_0$  under the projection  $\bar{X} \setminus \Lambda_\Gamma \rightarrow \bar{Y}_\Gamma$ . By definition,  $\bar{F}_0 \subset (\bar{X} \setminus \Lambda_\Gamma)$ .

For  $i = 1, \dots, r$  we define  $F_i := \Gamma \bar{Y}_{P_i} \cap F$ . We then have  $\overline{\Gamma_{P_i} F_i} \cap (\Lambda_\Gamma \setminus \{\infty_{P_i}\}) \cap \text{supp}(\chi^{\Gamma_{P_i}}) = \emptyset$  since the contrary this would imply  $e(\bar{Y}_{P_i}) \cap \Gamma_{P_i} \setminus (\Lambda_\Gamma \setminus \{\infty_{P_i}\}) \neq \emptyset$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.4** *Let  $\chi_1, \chi_2$  be two choices of the cut-off function  $\chi^{\Gamma_P}$  in Definition 1.6. Then*

$$\sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} \langle \chi_1 f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}, \tilde{\varphi}(g)^{-1} g^* h \rangle = \sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} \langle \chi_2 f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}, \tilde{\varphi}(g)^{-1} g^* h \rangle ,$$

where  $[P]_\Gamma$ ,  $f$ , and  $h$  are as 1.6.

*Proof.* The estimates given in the proof of [1], Lemma 4.2, show that all sums below converge absolutely. This justifies the resummations in the following computation. In the first and the last equality we use the  $\Gamma$ -invariance of  $f$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} \langle \chi_1 f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}, \tilde{\varphi}(g)^{-1} g^* h \rangle &= \sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} \langle g^* \chi_1 f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}, h \rangle \\ &= \sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} \sum_{l \in \Gamma_P} \langle g^* \chi_1 l^* \chi_2 f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}, h \rangle \\ &= \sum_{l \in \Gamma_P} \sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} \langle g^* \chi_1 l^* \chi_2 f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}, h \rangle \\ &= \sum_{l \in \Gamma_P} \langle l^* \chi_2 f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}, h \rangle \\ &= \sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} \langle \chi_2 f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}, \tilde{\varphi}(g)^{-1} g^* h \rangle . \end{aligned}$$

□

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1.8

We adapt the argument of the proof of [1], Thm.4.7 given there in the special case of a convex-cocompact group  $\Gamma$  to the present situation where  $\Gamma$  is geometrically finite.

**Definition 3.1** *We call the bundle  $V$  spherical, if  $V = \Lambda^{\frac{1-t(V)}{2}}$  for some  $t(V) \in \mathbb{C}$ .*

Note that  $\operatorname{Re} t(V) = s(V)$ . We first show the following special case.

**Proposition 3.2** *Theorem 1.8 is true if  $V$  is spherical.*

*Proof.* Let  $f \in I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, V, \varphi)$ . Then we must show that  $\langle f, h \rangle = 0$  for any  $h \in C^\infty(\partial X, \tilde{V}) \otimes \tilde{V}_\varphi$ .

**Lemma 3.3** *If  $\Gamma$  does not contain any hyperbolic element, then  $\langle f, h \rangle = 0$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\Gamma$  does not contain any hyperbolic element, then  $\Gamma = \Gamma_P$  for the unique cusp  $[P]_\Gamma$  of  $\Gamma$ . Since  $f$  is supported on  $\Lambda_\Gamma = \{\infty_P\}$  as a distribution we have  $f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}} = 0$ . This implies  $\langle f, h \rangle = \sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} \langle \chi^{\Gamma_P} f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}, \tilde{\varphi}(g)^{-1} g^* h \rangle = 0$ . □

It remains to consider the case that  $\Gamma$  contains a hyperbolic element which we will denote by  $g_0$ .

**Lemma 3.4** *If  $\Gamma$  does contain a hyperbolic element, say  $g_0$ , then  $\langle f, h \rangle = 0$ .*



*Proof.* Let  $b_{\pm} \in \partial X$  denote the attracting and repelling fixed points of  $g_0$ . We can write  $h = h_+ + h_-$  such that  $h_{\pm}$  vanishes in a neighbourhood of  $b_{\mp}$ . It suffices to show that  $\langle f, h \rangle = 0$  for any  $h$  which vanishes in a neighbourhood of say  $b_+$ .

We fix the origin  $\mathbf{o} \in X$  such that  $\mathbf{o}$  is on the unique geodesic connecting  $b_-$  with  $b_+$ . Let  $\tilde{F} \subset X$  be the Dirichlet domain of  $\Gamma$  with respect to this choice of the origin. Furthermore, let  $\bar{\tilde{F}}$  be the closure of  $\tilde{F}$  in  $X \setminus \Lambda_{\Gamma}$ . The Dirichlet domain  $D_{\langle g_0 \rangle}$  with respect to  $\mathbf{o}$  of the group  $\langle g_0 \rangle$  generated by  $g_0$  separates  $X \setminus D_{\langle g_0 \rangle}$  into two connected components  $X_+$  and  $X_-$ . Let  $\partial X_{\pm} := \bar{\tilde{F}}_{\pm} \cap \partial X$ . We can assume that  $b_{\pm} \in \partial X_{\pm}$ .

Replacing  $\mathbf{o}$ , if necessary, by  $g_0^j \mathbf{o}$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$  sufficiently large, we can assume that  $\text{supp}(h) \subset \partial X_-$ . Then we define  $F := g_0^i \tilde{F}$ ,  $\bar{F} := g_0^i \bar{\tilde{F}}$ , where we choose  $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$  sufficiently large such that  $F \subset X_+$ .

We use the polar coordinates  $(a, k) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \partial X$  in order to parametrize points  $x \in X \setminus \{\mathbf{o}\}$  such that  $a(x) = \exp(\text{dist}(\mathbf{o}, x))$  and  $k(x) \in \partial X$  is represented by the geodesic ray through  $x$  starting in  $\mathbf{o}$ . Using these coordinates we extend  $h$  to the interior of  $X$  setting  $\tilde{h}(x) = \chi(a(x))h(k(x))$ , where  $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$  is some cut-off function which is equal to one near infinity and vanishes for  $a < 1$ . Note that  $\text{supp}(\tilde{h}) \subset X \setminus X_+$ .

Note that by our assumption  $V$  is spherical and  $s(V) > 0$ . Therefore, the Poisson transformation

$$P : C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V) \rightarrow C^\infty(X)$$

is injective (we refer to [1] and the literature cited therein (e.g. [7]) for a definition of the Poisson transformation and its properties). We use the same symbol  $P$  in order to denote the extension of the Poisson transform to the tensor product by  $V_\varphi$ .

Using the polar coordinates we pull-back the volume form of the unit sphere in  $T_{\mathbf{o}}X$  to  $\partial X$  and thus obtain a volume form  $dk$  on  $\partial X$ . Then the inverse of the Poisson transformation is given by the following limit formula

$$\langle f, h \rangle = c_1 \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} a^{\rho(1-t(V))} \int_{\partial X} \langle Pf(a(x), k), h(k) \rangle dk$$

for some constant  $c_1$ . Using the fact that for large  $a$  the volume form  $dx$  can be written as  $dx = c_2 a^{2\rho} da dk + O(a^{2\rho-1})$  we deduce

$$\langle f, h \rangle = c \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} a^{-\rho(1+t(V))} \int_{\{x \in G \mid a \leq a(x) \leq a_0 a\}} \langle Pf(x), \tilde{h}(x) \rangle dx .$$

where  $c$  depends on  $c_1$ ,  $a_0 > 1$ , and  $c_2$ . We now employ the covering of  $X$  by translates of the fundamental domain  $gF$ ,  $g \in \Gamma$ , and the  $\Gamma$ -invariance of  $Pf$

$$Pf(gx) = \varphi(g) Pf(x) .$$

We get

$$\langle f, h \rangle = c \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} a^{-\rho(1+t(V))} \sum_{g \in \Gamma} \int_{\{x \in F \mid a \leq a(gx) \leq a_0 a\}} \langle \varphi(g) Pf(x), \tilde{h}(gx) \rangle dx .$$

Since  $\text{supp}(\tilde{h}) \subset X \setminus X_+$  we have  $gF \cap X \setminus X_+ \neq \emptyset$  if  $g \in \Gamma$  contributes to the sum above. The triangle inequality for  $X$  gives  $a(x)a(g) \geq a(gx)$ , where we write  $a(g)$  for  $a(g\mathbf{o})$ . We will also need the following converse version of the triangle inequality.

**Lemma 3.5** *There exists  $a_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for all  $g \in \Gamma$  with  $gF \cap X \setminus X_+ \neq \emptyset$  and  $x \in F$  we have  $a(g)a(x) \leq a_1 a(gx)$ .*

We postpone the proof of this lemma and continue the argument for Lemma 3.4. Using 3.5 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \{x \in F \mid a \leq a(gx) \leq a_0 a\} &\subset \{x \in F \mid a \leq a(x)a(g) \leq a_1 a\} \\ &= \{x \in F \mid aa(g)^{-1} \leq a(x) \leq a_1 aa(g)^{-1}\} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $g \in \Gamma$  with  $gF \cap X \setminus X_+ \neq \emptyset$ . Taking into account that  $\tilde{h}$  is bounded and that for given  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a constant  $C_0$  such that for all  $g \in \Gamma$  we have  $\|\varphi(g)\| \leq C_0 a(g)^{\rho(d_\varphi + \epsilon)}$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\{x \in F \mid a \leq a(gx) \leq a_0 a\}} \langle \varphi(g) Pf(x), \tilde{h}(gx) \rangle dx \right| \\ & \leq C_1 a(g)^{\rho(d_\varphi + \epsilon)} \int_{\{x \in F \mid aa(g)^{-1} \leq a(x) \leq a_1 aa(g)^{-1}\}} |Pf(x)| dx , \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where  $C$  is independent of  $g \in \Gamma$  and  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . In order to proceed further we employ the following crucial estimate.

**Lemma 3.6** *There is a constant  $C_1$  such that*

$$\int_{\{x \in F | b \leq a(x) \leq a_1 b\}} |Pf(x)| dx \leq C_1 b^{\rho(s(V)+1-\mu)}$$

for all sufficiently small  $\mu > 0$  and all  $b \geq 1$ .

We again postpone the proof of Lemma 3.6 and continue with the proof of Lemma 3.4. If we insert the estimate claimed in Lemma 3.6 into (1) and sum over  $\Gamma$ , then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{g \in \Gamma} \left| \int_{\{x \in F | a \leq a(gx) \leq a_0 a\}} \langle \varphi(g) Pf(x), \tilde{h}(gx) \rangle dx \right| \\ & \leq C_2 \sum_{g \in \Gamma} a(g)^{\rho(d_\varphi + \epsilon + \mu - s(V) - 1)} a^{\rho(s(V)+1-\mu)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_3$  is independent of  $a \geq 1$ . If we choose  $\mu, \epsilon > 0$  so small such that  $d_\varphi + \epsilon + \mu - s(V) < -d_\Gamma$ , then the sum converges and the right-hand side can be estimated by  $C_3 a^{\rho(s(V)+1-\mu)}$  with  $C_3$  independent of  $a \geq 1$ . We conclude that

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} a^{-\rho(t(V)+1)} \sum_{g \in \Gamma} \int_{\{x \in F | a \leq a(gx) \leq a_0 a\}} \langle \varphi(g) Pf(x), \tilde{h}(gx) \rangle dx = 0,$$

and thus  $\langle f, h \rangle = 0$ .

It remains to prove Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6.

*Proof.* [of Lemma 3.5] Note that for all  $g \in \Gamma$  one of the following two conditions fails:

$$\begin{aligned} gg_0^i \mathbf{o} & \in X_+ \\ gF \cap (X \setminus X_+) & \neq \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, if the first condition holds, then  $gF \cap X_+ \neq \emptyset$ . We conclude that  $gF \subset X_+$  and hence  $gF \cap (X \setminus X_+) = \emptyset$ . Further note that

$$\overline{\{gg_0^i \mathbf{o} | g \in \Gamma \text{ and } gF \cap (X \setminus X_+) \neq \emptyset\}} \cap \partial X = \overline{\{g\mathbf{o} | g \in \Gamma \text{ and } gF \cap (X \setminus X_+) \neq \emptyset\}} \cap \partial X.$$

We see that  $\bar{F} \cap \partial X \subset \text{int} \partial X_+$  and  $\overline{\{g\mathbf{o} | g \in \Gamma \text{ and } gF \cap (X \setminus X_+) \neq \emptyset\}} \cap \partial X \subset \partial X \setminus \partial X_+$  are disjoint. We now obtain the desired inequality from Corollary 2.5 of [1].  $\square$

*Proof.* [of Lemma 3.6]

It is at this point where we use that  $\Gamma$  is geometrically finite. Namely, let  $F_0 \cup F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_r$  be the decomposition of  $F$  given in Lemma 2.3.

Since  $\Lambda_\Gamma$  and  $\bar{F}_0$  are separated we can use [1], Lemma 6.2 (2), in order to get the estimate

$$\int_{\{x \in X | b \leq a(x) \leq a_1 b\} \cap F_0} |Pf(x)| dx \leq C b^{\rho(1-s(V))},$$

where  $C$  is independent of  $b \geq 1$ . This is the required estimate for the contribution of  $F_0$ .

It remains to consider the contributions of the cusps, i.e of  $F_i$ ,  $i > 0$ . Let now  $[P]_\Gamma$ ,  $P = P_i$  for one  $i > 0$ , be a cusp of  $\Gamma$ . Then for  $v \in V_{\tilde{\varphi}}$  and  $x \in X$  we have

$$\langle Pf(x), v \rangle = \sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} \langle \varphi(g) P(\chi^{\Gamma_P} f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}})(g^{-1}x), v \rangle.$$

Indeed, let  $p_{x,v} \in C^\infty(\partial X, \tilde{V}) \otimes V_{\tilde{\varphi}}$  denote the integral kernel of the map  $f \mapsto \langle P(f)(x), v \rangle$ . Then using the invariance properties of the kernel  $p_{x,v}$  and that  $f$  is strongly supported on the limit set we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Pf(x), v \rangle &= \langle p_{x,v}, f \rangle \\ &= \sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} \langle \chi^{\Gamma_P} f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}, \tilde{\varphi}(g)^{-1} g^* p_{x,v} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} \langle \chi^{\Gamma_P} f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}, p_{g^{-1}x, \tilde{\varphi}(g)v} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} \langle \varphi(g)^{-1} P(\chi^{\Gamma_P} f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}})(gx), v \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\overline{\Gamma_P F_i} \cap \text{supp}(\chi^{\Gamma_P} f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}}) = \emptyset$  we again apply [1], Lemma 6.2 (2), in order to get the estimate

$$|P(\chi^{\Gamma_P} f|_{\Omega_{\Gamma_P}})(gx)| \leq C a(gx)^{-\rho(s(V)+1)}, \quad (2)$$

where  $C$  is independent of  $x \in F_i$  and  $g \in \Gamma_P$ . In order to estimate the sum over  $g \in \Gamma_P$  we need the following geometric lemma.

**Lemma 3.7** *There is a constant  $a_3 \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for all  $x \in F$  and  $g \in \Gamma_P$  we have  $a(gx) \geq a_3 \max(a(g)a(x)^{-1}, a(x))$ .*

Let us postpone the proof of the lemma und continue with the estimates. We choose  $\nu > 0$  sufficiently small such that  $d_{\Gamma_P} + d_\varphi - s(V) + \nu < 0$ . For those  $\nu$  using Lemma 3.7 and (2) we obtain for all  $x \in F_i$

$$\begin{aligned}
|P(f)(x)| &\leq C \sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} \|\varphi(g)^{-1}\| a(gx)^{-\rho(1+s(V))} \\
&\leq C_1 \sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} a(g)^{\rho d_\varphi} a(gx)^{-\rho(1+s(V))} \\
&\leq C_2 \sum_{g \in \Gamma_P} a(g)^{-\rho(1+d_{\Gamma_P}+\nu)} a(x)^{\rho(-s(V)+1+2d_{\Gamma_P}+2d_\varphi+2\nu)} \\
&\leq C_3 a(x)^{\rho(-s(V)+1+2d_{\Gamma_P}+2d_\varphi+2\nu)}
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $s(V) > d_\varphi + d_{\Gamma_P} + 1$  we can choose  $\kappa, \nu, \mu > 0$  such that  $-s(V) + 1 + 2d_{\Gamma_P} + 2d_\varphi + 2\nu + 2 + \kappa < s(V) + 1 - \mu$ . Then

$$|P(f)(x)| \leq C_3 a(x)^{\rho(1+s(V)-\mu)} a(x)^{-\rho(2+\kappa)} .$$

Lemma 3.6 now follows from the fact that the function  $X \ni x \mapsto a(x)^{-\rho(2+\kappa)} \in \mathbb{R}$  is integrable. In fact,

$$\int_{\{x \in F_i | b \leq a(x) \leq a_1 b\}} |Pf(x)| dx \leq C_3 b^{\rho(1+s(V)-\mu)} \int_X a(x)^{-\rho(2+\kappa)} dx \leq C_4 b^{\rho(1+s(V)-\mu)} ,$$

where  $C_4$  is independent of  $b$ . □

*Proof.* [of Lemma 3.7] We consider the triangle inequality for the triangle  $(\mathbf{o}, gx, g\mathbf{o})$  in  $X$  and obtain  $\text{dist}(\mathbf{o}, gx) + \text{dist}(g\mathbf{o}, gx) \geq \text{dist}(\mathbf{o}, g\mathbf{o})$ . Since  $\text{dist}(g\mathbf{o}, gx) = \text{dist}(\mathbf{o}, x)$  we conclude that  $a(x)a(gx) \geq a(g)$ .

Recall that  $F$  is a Dirichlet domain of  $\Gamma$  with respect to  $g_0^i \mathbf{o}$ . We conclude that  $\text{dist}(g_0^i \mathbf{o}, x) \leq \text{dist}(g_0^i \mathbf{o}, gx)$  for all  $g \in \Gamma_P$  and  $x \in F$ . Using this and the triangle inequality for the triangle  $(\mathbf{o}, x, g_0^i \mathbf{o})$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{dist}(\mathbf{o}, x) &\leq \text{dist}(g_0^i \mathbf{o}, x) + \text{dist}(\mathbf{o}, g_0^i \mathbf{o}) \\
&\leq \text{dist}(g_0^i \mathbf{o}, gx) + \text{dist}(\mathbf{o}, g_0^i \mathbf{o}) \\
&\leq 2\text{dist}(g_0^i \mathbf{o}, \mathbf{o}) + \text{dist}(\mathbf{o}, gx)
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore  $a(gx) \geq a(g_0^i)^{-2}a(x)$  for all  $g \in \Gamma_P$  and  $x \in F$ . The assertion of the lemma holds true if we set  $a_3 := \min(1, a(g_0^i)^{-2})$   $\square$

We now have finished the proof of Lemma 3.4 and therefore of Proposition 3.2.  $\square$

*Proof.* [end of the proof of Theorem 1.8] By Proposition 3.2 we know that Theorem 1.8 holds true under the additional assumption that  $V$  is spherical. We twist by finite-dimensional representations of  $G$  in order to conclude the general case. Fix any parabolic subgroup  $P \subset G$ . Then we can write  $\partial X = G/P$ . If  $(\pi, V_\pi)$  is a finite-dimensional representation of  $G$ , then we can form the  $G$ -equivariant bundle  $V(\pi) = G \times_P V_\pi$  on  $\partial X$ . The idea of twisting is based on the fact that there is an  $G$ -equivariant isomorphism

$$C^\infty(\partial X, V \otimes V(\pi)) \otimes V_\varphi \xrightarrow{\cong} C^\infty(\partial X, V) \otimes V_\pi \otimes V_\varphi .$$

In particular, there is an isomorphism

$$j : I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, V \otimes V(\pi), \varphi) \xrightarrow{\cong} I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, V, \varphi \otimes \pi) .$$

If  $V$  is an irreducible  $G$ -equivariant bundle on  $\partial X$ , then there exists an irreducible representation  $(\pi, V_\pi)$  of  $G$  and a  $G$ -equivariant embedding

$$i : V \hookrightarrow \Lambda^{\frac{1-t(V)-d_\pi}{2}} \otimes V(\pi) ,$$

where  $t(V) \in \mathbb{C}$  is defined such that  $V \otimes \Lambda^{t(V)} = \tilde{V}$ . In particular,  $\text{Re}(t(V)) = s(V)$ . For these facts we refer to [1], p. 108 ( in particular, to the formulas (33), (34)). The embedding  $i$  composed with the isomorphism  $j$  gives an embedding

$$j \circ i : I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, V, \varphi) \hookrightarrow I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, \Lambda^{\frac{1-t(V)-d_\pi}{2}}, \varphi \otimes \pi) .$$

We can apply Prop. 3.2 to the right-hand side. Indeed,

$$s(\Lambda^{\frac{1-t(V)-d_\pi}{2}}) = s(V) + d_\pi > d_\Gamma + d_\varphi + d_\pi + \max_{[P]_\Gamma}(0, d_{\Gamma_P} - d_\Gamma + 1) = d_\Gamma + d_{\varphi \otimes \pi} + \max_{[P]_\Gamma}(0, d_{\Gamma_P} - d_\Gamma + 1) ,$$

and hence  $I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, \Lambda^{\frac{1-t(V)-d_\pi}{2}}, \varphi \otimes \pi) = 0$ . This implies  $I_{\Lambda_\Gamma}(\Gamma, V, \varphi) = 0$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] U. Bunke and M. Olbrich. The spectrum of Kleinian manifolds. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 172(2000), 76–164.
- [2] U. Bunke and M. Olbrich. Regularity of invariant distributions. Preprint arXiv:math.DG/0103144.
- [3] U. Bunke and M. Olbrich. Scattering theory for geometrically finite groups. Preprint arXiv:math.DG/9904137.
- [4] K. Corlette. Hausdorff dimensions of limit sets. *Invent. math.*, 102 (1990), 521–542.
- [5] K. Corlette and A. Iozzi. Limit sets of discrete groups of isometries of exotic hyperbolic spaces. *Trans. AMS*, 351 (1999), 1507–1530.
- [6] S. Patterson. The Laplace operator on a Riemann surface II. *Comp. Math.*, 32(1976), 71–112.
- [7] H. Schlichtkrull. *Hyperfunctions and Harmonic Analysis on Symmetric Spaces*. Birkhäuser, Boston, 1984.
- [8] D. Sullivan. The density at infinity of a discrete group of hyperbolic motions. *I.H.E.S. Publ. Math.*, 50(1979), 171–209.

Ulrich Bunke and Martin Olbrich

Universität Göttingen

Mathematisches Institut

Bunsenstr. 3-5

37073 Göttingen

GERMANY

bunke@uni-math.gwdg.de, olbrich@uni-math.gwdg.de